

REMARKS

Regarding the claims, claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3, 6, 10-12, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Akiyama. Claims 2, 4, 7, and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama in view of Jones. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama in view of Warner. Claims 8, 9, 13, and 14 stand objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner is correct in assuming that the dependency of these claims was intended to be from base claim 10 rather than base claim 1. Accordingly, these claims have been amended to appropriately reflect the intention of Applicant. Consequently, the 112 rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 10-12, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Akiyama. Claim 1 and claim 10 have been amended to include all the limitations of dependant claims 8 and 13, respectively. Claims 8 and 13 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, the 102 rejection of claims 1 and 10, and the claims depending from these claims, is respectfully overcome.

Claims 2, 4, 7, and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama. Claim 1 and claim 10 have been amended to include all

the limitations of dependant claims 8 and 13, respectively. Claims 8 and 13 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Dependant claims 2, 4, and 7 include all the limitations of their base claim 1. Similarly, dependant claim 19 includes all the limitation of its base claim 10. Because claims 1 and 10 as rewritten have been indicated as allowable, the 103 rejection of claims 2, 4, 7, and 19 is now also respectively overcome.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama in view of Jones. Claim 1 has been amended to include all the limitations of dependant claim 8. Claim 8 has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Dependant claim 5 includes all the limitations of its base claim 1. Because claim 1 as rewritten have been indicated as allowable, the 103 rejection of claim 5 is now also respectively overcome.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama in view of Warner. Claim 10 has been amended to include all the limitations of dependant claim 13. Claim 10 has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Dependant claim 20 includes all the limitations of its base claim 10. Because claim 10 as rewritten has been indicated as allowable, the 103 rejection of claim 20 is now also respectively overcome.

Claims 8, 9, 13, and 14 stand objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim. Claim 1 and claim 10 have been amended to include all the limitations of dependant claims 8 and 13, respectively. Further claims 9 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 10 as rewritten, respectively. Accordingly, it is believe that claims 1, 9, 10, and 14 are now in allowable form.

Based on the forgoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, the attorney for the Applicant would appreciate a telephone call at the number provided below.

Date: January 13, 2005


Sara A. Centioni
Sara A. Centioni
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 50,543
Nexsen Pruet, LLC
P.O. Drwr 2426
Columbia, SC 29202-2426
803-540-2111
scentioni@nexsenpruet.com